2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 AT SEATTLE 7 LYNN DALE HOVER and MILA JEAN 8 HOVER, CASE NO. C17-0902RSM 9 Plaintiffs, 10 ORDER STRIKING UNTIMELY **RESPONSES** v. 11 GMAC MORTGAGE CORPORATION 12 aka DITECH FINANCIAL LLC dba 13 ditech.com, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 On September 18, 2017, Plaintiffs filed three responses to Defendants' pending Motions 16 to Dismiss. Dkts. #33, #34, and #35. Plaintiffs previously moved for an extension of time to 17 respond to one of those pending motions to dismiss – that filed by Defendant Northwest Trustee 18 19 Services, Inc. Dkt. #23. The Court granted that motion and allowed Plaintiffs to file an untimely 20 response. Dkt. #29. However, in that same Order the Court explicitly noted: 21 Plaintiffs have not moved for an extension of time to respond to the pending 22 motions to dismiss filed by Defendants Fannie Mae, MERS, Nationstar Mortgager LLC, Bank of America, N.A., and Ditech Financial. Dkts. #17, 23 #19 and #22. Those motions are ripe for review and no extension of time to respond to those motions has been granted. 24 25 Dkt. #29 at 2 (emphasis in original). In complete violation of the Court's Order, Plaintiffs have 26 now filed their untimely responses and ask the Court to accept them simply because they are pro 27

1

se Plaintiffs. Dkt. #32.

ORDER PAGE - 1

28

The Court has previously informed Plaintiffs that they are expected to be familiar with the Court's Local Rules, particularly those related to the filing of motions and responses. Dkt. #29 at 2. Plaintiffs have demonstrated that they know how to ask the Court for permission to file untimely responses, as they have done so in this case. *See* Dkt. #23. For whatever reason, they declined to follow proper Court procedures with respect to two of the pending Motions to Dismiss.

Accordingly, the Court hereby STRIKES Plaintiffs' responses (Dkts. #34 and #35) to the pending motions to dismiss filed by Defendants Fannie Mae, MERS, Nationstar Mortgager LLC, Bank of America, N.A., and Ditech Financial, and the Court will not consider those responses in reviewing Defendants' motions.

DATED this 19 day of September, 2017.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE